DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 844 SP 029 063

AUTHOR McCloskey, Gary N.; And Others
TITLE A Profession at Risk: Legislated Learning as a Disincentive to Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 87
CONTRACT ERI-P-86-3088
NOTE 63p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Legislation; *Educational Policy; Locus of Control; Professional Autonomy; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Motivation; Teacher Persistence
IDENTIFIERS *Florida; *Legislated Learning

ABSTRACT

As various branches of local, state, and national government have attempted to improve educational performance, the policies imposed on schools have removed much control of teaching and the classroom from teachers. This study reports on an unintended outcome of this "legislated learning," that is, the creation of situations that are disincentives for teachers for remaining in the profession. Florida, because of its extensive program of legislated learning, is used as a case study in this investigation. Data included the record of legislation on education in Florida, interviews, and survey data on teacher perceptions from the project, "Teacher Work, Incentives and Rewards: A Twenty Year Perspective." The following disincentives to remaining in teaching were found: (1) lack of recognition of teachers' understanding of schools and the educational process in the development of reform; (2) constant and inconsistent changes in the teaching program; (3) evaluation and incentive programs whose techniques imply teacher incompetency; (4) added burdens in an already difficult work situation; (5) formulas and models that needlessly regulate and control teaching; (6) a system that rejects people in favor of products; (7) lack of recognition of the experience teachers have accumulated; and (8) treating all atudents the same. Policy recommendations are made to help eliminate these disincentives. (Author/MT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED284844

A Profession at Risk:
Legislated Learning as a Disincentive to Teaching

by

Gary N. McCloskey, O.S.A., St. Thomas University
Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., University of Miami
Marilyn M. Cohn, Washington University
Robert B. Kottkamp, Hofstra University

Contract # ERI-P-86-3088
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
United States Department of Education

March, 1987

SP 029 063

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. McCloskey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Profession at Risk:
Legislated Learning as a Disincentive to Teaching

by
Gary N. McCloskey, O.S.A., St.Thomas University
Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., University of Miami
Marilyn M. Cohn, Washington University
Robert B. Kottkamp, Hofstra University

Contract # ERI-P-86-3088
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
United States Department of Education

ABSTRACT

Nearly a decade ago, Arthur E. Wise observed in his book, Legislated Learning: The Bureaucratization of the American Classroom, that:

> In recent years the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government have imposed a myriad of new policies upon schools and colleges in order to improve their performance.(p.1)

This study reports on an unintended outcome of this "legislated learning," i.e., the creation of situations which are disincentives for teachers, particularly, disincentives to veteran teachers for remaining in the profession.

In this study Florida, because of its extensive program of legislated learning, is used as a case study. Legislated learning is investigated from the perspective of teachers. The data base included the record of legislation on education in Florida, interviews and survey data on teacher perceptions. The data from teachers came from a National Institute of Education project (1983-1985) "Teacher Work, Incentives and Rewards: A Twenty Year Perspective."

Based upon study of these data the following disincentives to remaining in the teaching profession were found:

1. The lack of recognition of teachers' understanding of schools and the educational process in the development of reform.
2. Constant and inconsistent changes in the teaching program.
3. Evaluation and incentive programs whose techniques imply a questioning of teachers' professional competency.
4. Added burdens in an already difficult work situation.
5. Formulas and models which needlessly regulate and control rather than enhance teaching.
6. A system which rejects people in favor of products.
7. A system which refuses to recognize the experience teachers have accumulated from their work in the field and which insists on always treating them as beginning teachers.
8. A system which unfairly treats students who are truly different as if they were the same.

Policy recommendations are made to work toward eliminating these disincentives.

SP029063

Statement of the Problem

Nearly a decade ago, Arthur E. Wise observed in his book Legislated Learning: The Bureaucratization of the American Classroom that:

> In recent years the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government have imposed a myriad of new policies upon schools and colleges in order to improve their performance. These policies are designed, on the one hand, to eliminate inequities arising from discrimination on the basis of race, sex, poverty or other factors, and on the other, to make the schools perform more productively. (Wise, 1979, p.1)

The trend which Wise observed has continued. According to Wise there is an implicit or unstated model of school management at work (p. xxii) which goes beyond a simple response to social or educational problems.

> Educational policymakers behave as though they believe that schools operate according to the rationalistic model. That model postulates that schools operate by setting goals, implementing programs to achieve these goals, and evaluating the extent to which the goals are attained. The goal-oriented process is assumed to be effectuated through a bureaucratic distribution of formal authority and work responsibility. It is further assumed that the attainment of goals provides sufficient incentives to drive the system. Policies emanating from a belief in this model are designed to improve the operation of the goal-oriented process. Policies which promise to increase productivity and equity are imposed on the existing structure of the school in the anticipation that they will improve education. (p.78)

But, argues Wise, there is a disjunction between the rationalistic model and its assumptions about how schools work and can be changed and the reality of how they actually work. A major issue left unexamined in the rationalistic approaches to changing schools is the process of education, or "how educational practice actually affects the child." (p.56) Wise goes on to

extrapolate rationalistic assumptions about teaching and learning:

> 1. The child is pliable, at least within the range of normal aptitude and normal expectations.
> 2. The teacher is pliable and will modify his or her behavior to comply with legislation, court orders, regulations, or scientific knowledge about education.
> 3. A science of education exists which yields treatments that can be applied by teacher to student.
> 4. If shown the way, people prefer cost-effective behavior over behavior which is not cost-effective. (p.57)

Wise's assertions about the implicit theory of legislated learning do not seem to be part of an isolated movement. Rather, they appear to be part of a larger approach to management of organizations. Boleman and Deal (1985) from their studies of management posit four "frames" commonly used to analyze and explain the behavior of organizations. Each of these frames consists of a cluster of underlying assumptions which bind together a group of more specific theories into a general explanatory perspective. Wise's arguments about a rationalistic model are a more situation specific statement of Boleman and Deal's Structural Frame. The assumptions identified with this frame include:

> 1. Organizations exist primarily to accomplish established goals.
> 2. For any organization, there is a structure appropriate to goals, the environment, the technology, and the participants.
> 3. Organizations work most effectively when environmental turbulence and the personal preferences of participants are constrained by norms of rationality.
> 4. Specialization permits higher levels of individual expertise and performance.
> 5. Coordination and control are accomplished best through the exercise of authority and impersonal rules.
> 6. Structures can be systematically designed and implemented.

> 7. Organizational problems usually reflect an inappropriate structure and can be resolved through redesign and reorganization. (Boleman and Deal, p. 32)

These structural (rationalistic) assumptions subsume such thinkers as Frederick Taylor on structure and efficiency and Max Weber on bureaucracy. This frame describes the "common sense" thinking that predominates in both individual and public thought about organizations. However, this "common sense," as Wise asserts (p.56), does not fully take into account the reality of schools as well as the impact of changes brought about by programs developed based on this "common sense."

While professional autonomy and instructional decision making authority are often viewed as necessary prerequisites to creativity and innovation, state or district standards, or uniform rules of accountability, are often seen by teachers as impediments to such creativity and disincentives to those working as teachers. As one teacher characterized the recent battery of reports on the need for government reform of education:

> The people writing them and the people reading them aren't in the classroom.(41, F, W, Jr/M, Basic Math)

As a result, this policy "drive" towards performance productivity implicitly removes much of the control of teaching and of the classroom from teachers. Such a change in the locus of control has had a significant effect on teachers' experiences and perceptions about their work. Government, in press to respond to societal problems, seems to have removed from teachers the autonomy it used to implicitly give to teachers.(Lortie, 1969) Thus, the present relationship between teachers' professional

autonomy and government's responsibility to regulate education can be characterized as dissonant.

This report addresses, from the teachers' perspective, the tension which exists between the proper exercise of governmental responsibility on the one hand and the professional autonomy of teachers on the other. Recommendations are made for the adjustment and balance of this tension.

Description of the Data Base

Considering that there are fifty states in the Union, as well as the federal government which regulate various aspects of education, the task of analyzing how teachers are affected by governmental regulation of education is difficult. The analysis of this process, on a case study basis, provides a potential means to understand, in a meaningful way, how this process works.

This policy study relies on data gathered in Florida as the basis for generalizable recommendations to alleviate the tension between the needs of teachers and the government regulation of schools particularly at the state level. The minimizing of this tension is understood to be a means to reduce current disincentives to teaching. The data used for this study were collected as part of a larger research project, "Teacher Work, Incentives and Rewards: A Twenty Year Perspective" sponsored by the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education (Contact # N.I.E.-G-83-0067), dealing with perceptions and attitudes of teachers towards their work. This N.I.E. project used as its baseline, data collected by Dan C. Lortie in the mid-

1960s for his classic work Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study (1975). The research extended Lortie's work through the use of a teacher survey, administered in April 1984, an interview study conducted between May 1984 and August 1985, and the collection of historical data.[1] Questions used in the interviews replicated much of Lortie's study, which focused on work rewards and incentives for teachers. New questions were asked dealing with current issues, among which were questions on merit pay, on the decline in respect for the teaching profession and on parental involvement in the education of their children.

In addition to the data collected for the National Institute of Education research, this study relies on legal and historical research dealing with the development and implementation of state regulated initiatives that have taken place in Florida since the mid-1970s. The major focus of the legal research was the yearly

---

[1] The teacher survey drew a 40% random sample of classroom teachers (N=4,247 from each school in the Dade County Public School system (N=251). A total of 2,718 teachers (64%) responded to the survey. From the 40% sample a stratified random sample of 100 teachers was drawn for interviews. Stratification was accomplished by assigning each school to a three by three matrix consisting of three levels of socio-economic status and three levels of grade range (elementary, junior high and senior high). Thirty-six schools were randomly selected for the nine cells and teachers then randomly selected within each school were chosen. A total of 73 teachers eventually participated in the interviews, of which 53 were women and 20 were men. The grade level figures were 30 elementary, 17 junior high, and 26 senior high teachers. The ethnic mix was 48 whites, 15 blacks and 10 hispanics. In this paper each of the quotes from the interviews is identified with a number assigned to each interviewee, a designation for sex, ethnicity (Black, Hispanic, White), school grade level (Elementary, Junior, Senior)/school socio-economic level (Low, Medium, High) and interviewee's teaching area.

compilation of Acts passed by the state legislature as recorded in Laws of Florida (1976-1984).

Delimitations

Based on the data collected, this policy study addresses the issue from the perspective of teacher perception rather than student performance. The legal data used provide insight into the nature of legislated reform and its impact on the work of teachers. Thus, this is an investigation of the interaction between the state legislature, including to some degree the specific formatting of state mandates by local districts, and the classroom teacher. Within this context, this study does not attempt to look at the legislature as an institution, at individual legislators, at the process of the enactment of reforms or at the development of the administrative implementation of enacted reforms. (Lehne, 1983). Instead, it focuses on laws created by the state legislature that can be seen as affecting the perceptions of teachers in the classroom.

Why Florida as a Case Study?

During the past decade, more than any other state in the Union, Florida has initiated educational reform through its legislature. Although some see the report A Nation At Risk (1983) as marking the beginning of the recent reform movement in education, it is clear that in states such as Florida this process was already well under way. In The Nation Responds (1984), which provides a summary of the educational reforms

undertaken in response to A Nation at Risk, the section for Florida is a compilation of reforms begun before the release of the report. Some of the laws reported were enacted in the 1983 legislative session, but were drafted and edited prior to the release of A Nation at Risk.

In The Nation Responds a report was included on "Recent Initiative Reported by States and the District of Columbia." (pp. 144-146). This report focused on the twenty areas of reform outlined in A Nation at Risk. These areas included:

1. Curriculum Reform
2. Graduation Requirements
3. College Admissions
4. Student Evaluation/Testing
5. Textbooks/Instructional Materials
6. Academic Recognition Programs
7. Instructional Time
8. Longer School Day
9. Longer School Year
10. Specialized Schools
11. Academic Enrichment Programs
12. School Discipline
13. Placement/Promotion Policies
14. Extra Curricular/Athletic Policies
15. Teacher Preparation/Certification
16. Salary Increases
17. Master Teacher/Career Ladders
18. Teacher Shortage
19. Professional Development/Teachers
20. Professional Development/Administrators

Of all the states reported, Florida and Tennessee were the only states to have enacted laws in sixteen of the twenty categories. No other states surpassed them. In addition, Florida was considering enactment of legislation in three of the four remaining categories: Curriculum Reform, Textbook/Instructional Materials, and School Discipline. (In the 1984 legislative

session, after the publication of The Nation Responds (1984), these three proposals were enacted into law.) Only Specialized Schools were not considered as proposed reform. Such a record demonstrates why this state is a prime case for studying governmental reform in education.

The type of governmental educational reform, occurring in Florida, through the state legislature is a classic example of what Arthur Wise has referred to as "legislated learning." According to Wise:

> Educational policy is more and more being determined by the states, by the federal government, and by the courts, rather than by schools and colleges themselves. State legislatures, demanding accountability, impose upon the schools managerial accounting schemes adopted from industry. State boards of education, concerned about diffuse educational goals, endeavor to reduce these goals to the basic skills alone. State courts require that schools become "thorough and efficient" as mandated by their state constitution. (p.ix)

Traditionally, not only in Florida, but in school districts across the country, local school boards have been empowered by the state legislature to determine curriculum, instruction and district policy. Over the course of the past decade, however, the Florida Legislature has increasingly intervened in the name of reform to attempt to determine the nature of policy at the local level. This phenomenon has led some to refer to the state legislature, euphemistically, as "a giant school board."

Beginning in 1976, for example, the Florida legislature enacted the "Educational Accountability Act of 1976." The purpose of this Act was to:

(a) Provide a system of accountability for education in

> Florida which guarantees that each student is afforded similar opportunities for educational advancement without regard to geographic differences and varying local economic factors.
>
> (b) Provide information to education decision-makers at the state, district, and school levels so that resources may be appropriately allocated and the needs of the system of public education met in a timely manner.
>
> (c) Provide information about costs of educational programs and the differential effectiveness of differing instructional programs so that the educational process may be improved continually.
>
> (d) Guarantee to each student in the Florida system of public education that the system provides instructional programs with minimum performance standards compatible with the state's plan for education.
>
> (e) Provide a more thorough analysis of program costs and the degree to which the various districts are meeting the minimum performance standards established by the State Board of Education.
>
> (f) Provide information to the public about the performance of the Florida system of public education in meeting established goals and providing effective, meaningful and relevant educational experiences designed to give students at least the minimum skills necessary to function and survive in today's society. (Chapter 76-223, Sec. 1, Laws of Florida, 1976)

The enactment of the "Educational Accountability Act of 1976" was, on the surface, an enactment of comprehensive minimal competency testing. In reviewing the intent of the law, it is difficult to argue with its purpose. However, this law was the beginning of a process which resulted in the mandating of competencies for each grade level Kindergarten through the Sophomore year of college by 1984. It is this secondary impact of the law--one not originally included in the 1976 legislation--that has been the primary source of difficulty for teachers in the public schools. Significantly, for the purposes of this

policy study, 1984 also marks the beginning of the research and data collection of teacher perceptions upon which this study is based.

The Record of Florida's Legislated Learning

The educational legislation enacted in Florida between 1976 and 1984 was not only massive in scope, but it also radically redefined traditional roles and duties assigned to teachers, administrators and school boards. While none of the individual pieces of legislation passed during this period were responsible for this change, their cumulative effect was overwhelming. In order to appreciate, more fully, the evolution of this process, it is necessary to review the historical accumulation of this legislation.

Following the passage of Florida's "Educational Accountability Act of 1976" relatively minor educational legislation was passed in 1977. In 1978, two major reforms affecting policy were enacted. These included the reform of teacher certification (Chapter 78-423) and the requirement that all people graduating from high school pass the minimum basic skills test for the eleventh grade (Chapter 78-424). This was the test enacted in 1976. Under the teacher certification reforms, teachers were no longer certified for life, but instead for five year periods, with requirements for recertification. In addition, in 1978 the requirement for a minimum score on the S.A.T. or A.C.T. examinations in order to enter teacher education programs was established, as well as the requirement of passing a

written examination for initial certification, and of the participation in a beginning teacher program for those individuals teaching in Florida for the first time.

Primary Education and Management Training

In 1979, two major pieces of educational legislation were enacted. The first law was the "Florida Primary Education Program" (Chapter 79-288). The second was the "Management Training Act of 1979" (Chapter 79-311). Under the "Florida Primary Education Program" a comprehensive prescriptive program for primary education (K-3) was mandated. Districts were instructed to develop programs ensuring individualized development, yet each student was to meet specified competencies by the end of Grade 3. Implementation of plans had to include initial screening, developmental strategies, further assessment, preventative and enrichment strategies. Promotion to Fourth Grade was contingent on the successful mastery of Grade 3 competencies. Competencies for teachers in Grades Kindergarten to Three were outlined, as well as the role of Primary Specialist.

Under the Management Training Act of 1979 school districts were directed to identify competencies for school managers and to effect school-based management. This legislation began the move from knowledge-based certification of principals and other school managers to performance-based certification. In addition to the two major laws described above, the legislature enacted various

educational policies whose intent was to clarify but not significantly change previous legislation. These policies included the requirement that public hearings be held before educational standards are set (Chapter 79-20), the right of all citizens to receive remediation for deficiencies they might have in minimum basic skills (Chapter 79-74), the establishment of a specific passing score for admission to teacher education programs and the requirement of a minimum percent of teacher education graduates passing the written teacher examination for the programs, from which they graduated, to be certified (Chapter 79-222), and the requirement of guidelines for the administration of corporal punishment (Chapter 79-288).

Performance Standards for Students, Teachers and Managers

The 1980 legislative session saw the passage of laws which established the Florida Council on Educational Management (Chapter 80-295) and a statewide assessment program (Chapter 80-392) in addition to previously legislated basic skills testing. Prior to this time, performance standards applied only to students and teachers, but with the creation of the Florida Council on Educational Management, performance standards were applied to administrators as well. The charge given to the Council was to identify and validate the competencies for school managers, to identify performance standards and training processes, to develop policies and procedures for compensation of school managers, and finally, to identify criteria for screening, selection and appointment of school managers.

Under the state assessment program, the legislature sought a means for the improvement of operation and management of the public schools. In this legislation, the Commissioner of Education was empowered to establish minimum performance standards for the assessment program, as well as a schedule for testing. Additional legislation passed during the 1980 session once again had as its purpose the clarification of previously enacted legislation. These included the establishment of an Educational Standards Commission together with an Educational Practices Commission for the purpose of reviewing standards of teacher performance (Chapter 80-190), the needs of exceptional education students in the light of performance standards (Chapter 80-295 and Chapter 80-325), the inclusion of the identification of needs of exceptional education students in regular classroom settings as a competency tested by the teacher examination (Chapter 80-325), and the empowerment of the State Board of Education to adopt rules governing the teacher examination (Chapter 80-378).

In 1981, the legislature refined and consolidated elements of previously legislated reforms. Based on the previous year's establishment of the Florida Council on Educational Management, the law (Chapter 80-241) enacted this year made the Council part of the Department of Education. This same law mandated the development and implementation of competency-based certification. To achieve this type of certification the law also created the Florida Academy for School Leaders for inservice training of

school managers, as well as the mandating of direct training programs for the managers. With respect to teachers, the legislature explicitly described in law (Chapter 81-243) the contents of the test. This law deleted the original listening section of the test and described the requirements for temporary certification. Additionally, this same law mandated the development of district plans for the previously legislated Beginning Teacher Program. Finally, the legislature began to address the question of textbooks/instructional materials with the establishment of Instructional Materials Councils (Chapter 81-56).

In 1982 the legislature passed laws affecting three major areas of education. These included College Level Performance Standards (Chapter 82-180), Writing Skills (Chapter 82-217) and Personnel Assessment (Chapter 82-242). The College Level Performance Standards included the development of assessment tests which were to become a condition for the earning of an Associate of Arts degree in any public higher education institution in the state of Florida. This test, The College Level Academic Skills Test (C.L.A.S.T.), was also to become a condition for study in upper level undergraduate programs in these institutions. Writing skills were addressed by the "Jack Gordon Writing Skills Act," named after the Dade County state senator. Rather than mandating a statewide program, the Writing Skills Act offered supplemental funding to those school districts which implemented an enhanced writing program based on the

provisions of the law.

The area of personnel assessment was affected through the requirement by the legislature for school districts to develop a plan for assessing teachers in their work. The law also required verification that those doing the assessment were knowledgeable concerning assessment procedures. Legislation was also passed in 1982 which exempted teachers from liability for reporting suspected drug abuse (Chapter 82-48) and classified beginning teachers as probationary employees (Chapter 82-242).

Secondary Education and the Educational Reform Act

In 1983, the state legislature implemented two far-reaching pieces of legislation. The first, commonly called the "RAISE" bill set performance standards for high school students (Chapter 83-324). The second, the Educational Reform Act of 1983 addressed a wide-range of items including standards of excellence in mathematics and science, the critical teacher shortage, quality instruction incentives and merit pay for teachers (Chapter 83-327).

Under the RAISE bill, for the first time, the legislature mandated course specific requirements for high school graduation. In addition, it mandated performance standards for academic programs and strengthened both the Florida Academic Scholar Program and the academic performance standards required for athletes. This legislation identified the classroom teacher as the primary authority for assessment, but that authority was subject to school board policies. It also called for the

increased use of computers to reduce teacher paperwork. Significantly, this legislation introduced professional service contracts for teachers as opposed to the traditional continuing contract. In terms of certification, the RAISE bill called for the development of rigorous inservice institutes, as well as increasing the number of credits in upper division specialization courses for secondary school teachers to thirty.

The Educational Reform Act of 1983 mandated the improvement of education in math and science through (1) the development of standards of excellence; (2) the development of a state comprehensive plan (K-12) for mathematics, science and computer education; (3) the establishment of mathematics, science, and computer learning laboratories (K-12); (4) the establishment of cooperative relationships among colleges, universities and schools in mathematics, science, and computer education; (5) the establishment of regional centers for mathematics, science and computer education; and (6) grants for programs in mathematics, science and computer education.

Also addressed in the Reform Act of 1983 was the problem of the critical teacher shortage. The legislated solutions to the problem were: (1) teacher/scholarship loan programs; (2) tuition reimbursement for currently employed teachers; and (3) a student loan forgiveness program. Under this same act, the school year was extended to include 1,050 hours of instruction per year. Within this period of instruction, allowance was made for students to increase their credit load from six to seven courses

a year on the high school level.

Quality Instruction Incentives were a prime concern of the legislators in the Reform Act. The legislature created the Florida Quality Instruction Incentives Council and mandated district incentive plans which were to increase performance through providing incentives to instructional personnel. In addition to district plans, the legislature established the Meritorious Instruction Personnel Program. This program was Florida's answer to merit pay for teachers. The intent of this individual level "merit pay" program was to recognize superior ability and provide economic incentives for teachers to continue in public school instruction.

In order to oversee the implementation of the Reform Act, the legislature created the Educational Reform Study Committee and through additional legislation involved the Quality Instruction Incentive Council in that study (Chapter 83-348). The Reform Act of 1983 was set to be effective through the 1984-1985 year and after that time only if funded. Finally, in 1983 the legislature gave access to the personnel files of teachers to officials investigating cases where teachers were subject to legal proceedings (Chapter 83-135).

Middle Schools and Reforming the Reforms

In 1984, the legislature passed in a single law (Chapter 84-336) a series of unrelated educational reforms. Included in this law was (1) the Teacher as Advisors Act; (2) Competency certification for principals; (3) A reworking of the Quality

Incentives and Meritorious and Instructional Personnel Programs; (4) an "On-the-job" certification program for new teachers; (5) regulations for textbooks and instructional materials; (6) the Florida Progress in Middle Childhood Education (PRIME) Programs; (7) the requirements for a mandatory dropout prevention program in all school districts in the state; (8) the Florida Accountability in Curriculum, Educational Instructional Materials and Testing Act; (9) a call for a comprehensive evaluation of the educational reforms in this bill and other recent legislation; and (10) the establishment of an Institute for Instructional Research and Practice and Student Educational Evaluation and Performance.

Within the Teachers as Advisors Act, classroom teachers were to be utilized as academic advisors for students in order to increase interactive time of students between students and teachers. Chapter 84-336 also set July 1, 1986 as the date for implementation of competency certification for principals and established a center for research on and for principals. This same law placed the District Quality Instruction Incentives Program under the State Department of Education and struck down the requirements, enacted in 1983 (Chapter 83-327), that teachers rewarded in meritorious schools had to qualify under the Meritorious Instruction Personnel Program. Within the Meritorious Instruction Personnel Program changes were made. Among the changes were the renaming of the State Master Teacher Program, a specific description of the evaluation system, a

substantial reworking of the subject area tests and a tie in of the number of associate and master teachers to the level of appropriation.

In the area of textbooks/instructional materials, this same law mandated that textbooks and materials be consistent with goals, objectives and performance standards and be written for grade level, except for students needing remediation. In addition, justification would now be necessary for the use of non-adopted or formerly adopted textbooks and materials. An annual survey by superintendents and principals, with a report to the State Commissioner of Education, was to be conducted concerning textbooks and instructional materials.

In this same legislation, the Florida Progress in Middle Childhood Education (PRIME) Program extended to Grades 4-8 the same structure provided to Grades K-3 by PREP (Chapter 70-288) and Grades 9-12 by RAISE (Chapter 83-324). PRIME focused on readiness for high school through Fifth and Eighth grade assessments with an initial screening on entrance to Fourth Grade. The program for Grades 4 and 5 continued the regular schedule of study on the elementary level. Grades 6, 7, and 8 were designed for unit instruction similar to the high school program. This program called for the development of promotion policies, articulation of grades 4 and 5 with the PREP Program and Grades 6-8 with the RAISE Program. To assist in teacher retraining, inservice on middle grade teaching was added as acceptable credit toward extension of a teaching certificate. A

program for research on education in the middle grades was also established.

In two parts of this legislation, the need for integration of various reforms was recognized. In the Florida Accountability in Curriculum, Educational Instructional Materials and Testing Act, coordination of these various elements was addressed. The call for a comprehensive evaluation of reform, including PREP, RAISE and PRIME recognized the systemic nature of the reform that had been developed in piecemeal fashion.

Finally, in 1984 legislation was passed requiring that persons applying to teach be fingerprinted and that any teacher convicted of a crime be reported to the State Department of Education (Chapter 84-44). In addition to the dropout program mandated in Chapter 84-336, the School Discipline Act of 1984 (Chapter 84-255) was passed in an effort to coordinate factors affecting dropout rates. Within Chapter 84-395, the restriction on athletes barred from play because of academic failure was reduced from a semester to a grading period, as well as the establishment of the Florida Educational Equity Act which made previous administrative policies the law. As part of the Florida Youth Emotional Development and Suicide Prevention Act (Chapter 84-317) concern for the rising suicide rate among youths was expressed through the inclusion of suicide prevention materials in the high school curriculum and teacher in-service and certification programs.

Performance Standards: Promise/Reform/Change

Arthur Wise summarizes the general purpose of legislated learning programs in these words:

> Educational policies represent the efforts of policymakers to improve the educational system. Elected and appointed officials, external to local school systems or institutions of higher education, concerned with the operation of the educational system create policy to correct perceived deficiencies. Every educational policy expresses a promise--if not for reform, at least for change. And every educational policy has two components--the reform or change desired and a theory (stated or unstated) that provides the basis for believing that the reform or change will occur. (Wise, 1979, p. xii).

In reviewing the educational legislation enacted in Florida between 1976 and 1984, it is clear that the promise of this legislation taken as a whole is one that envisions a new performance-based model of education that extends from the Kindergarten level through the Sophomore year of college. This system is managed by a new type of local school board and school manager, under the watchful eye of the state legislature and the State Department of Education. Imbedded in this new model is an altered conception of the role of teachers in the educational process--a conception of the teacher as one who simply implements policy decided by others. The impact of these changes on teachers can be seen through their perceptions of their work. The following section of this study is an examination of the influence of this legislated learning on the teachers perceptions of professionalism, education and professional autonomy.

Legislated Learning: Teacher Perceptions

As reported above, teacher perceptions were collected

through a survey and an interview study. In the survey no questions were asked that directly dealt with legislated learning. However, in the interviews teachers' extended responses brought to light teacher-perceived problems with the record of legislated learning in Florida. Interestingly, teachers, across the board, made comments that implicitly questioned the unstated assumptions of the rationalistic "theory" of legislated learning. Those assumptions being:

> 1. The child is pliable, at least within the range of normal aptitude and normal expectations.
> 2. The teacher is pliable and will modify his or her behavior to comply with legislation, court orders, regulations or scientific knowledge about education.
> 3. A science of education exists which yields treatments that can be applied by teacher to student.
> 4. If shown the way, people prefer cost-effective behavior over behavior which is not cost-effective. (Wise, 1979, p. 57)

The teachers are not simply questioning the assumptions of the theory. Their perceptions are voices questioning "the basis for believing that the reform or change will occur" (Wise, p.xii.) As such, these perceptions are essential data for assessing whether there is legitimate hope that the promise of legislated learning can be delivered. In order to reach an overall understanding of the teachers' assessment of the record of legislated learning, the presentation of teachers perceptions in this report is organized in relation to the assumptions of the rationalistic "theory." Since the assumption about a science of education was the most problematic for the teachers it is reviewed first.

Existence of a Science of Education

With reference to the assumption of "the existence of a science of education which yields treatments that can be applied by teacher to student," Wise posits that:

> The ideology of management science has spawned the development of techniques specifically directed to education. In turn, these techniques have frequently been imposed by legislation--often before they have been developed. (Wise, 1979, p. 19)

The record of legislated learning in Florida is replete with instances of the application of management science techniques, including the reliance on performance standards and competency based models. However as Wise observes, the problem with the use of such techniques is the fact that they have often been inadequately developed before they were put into use. The teachers in the interviews for this study identify the process underlying legislated learning as primarily political, rather than scientific. A junior high school teacher explained that:

> I look at it as a political thing. The state administration and department of education has to do things to show the public that teachers are doing more to teach their children. This is all a political, P.R., type of thing.(65, M, W, Jr/H, Sci.Bio.

Because of this political basis for reform, one of the failures teachers observe in the development of legislated learning is the absence of real classroom teacher input into the process of formulating the "scientific" response. An absence of input which means teachers have no impact on the development of and lack a perspective on the "scientific" reasons for the changes and the relation of a particular change to the whole

program of legislated learning. In response to reports on the condition of education one junior high teacher said:

> The people writing them and the people reading them aren't in the classroom.(41, F, W, Jr/M, Basic Math)

Along the same lines another junior high teacher made this observation:

> I think many of the governors, from what I've heard, are truly interested in improving education and trying to find out what's best for them. But mostly, you have people advising them who are not classroom teachers.(65, M, W, Jr/H, Sci.Bio.)

A senior high school teacher expressed her feelings in the following manner:

> They can sit downtown all day long and they can make their rules and regulations. But, they don't really know what is going on within the classrooms.(71, F, B, Sr/M, Spec.Ed./ L.D.)

Teachers questioned how much "science" was involved when the solutions proposed to problems had little correlation to the reality of classrooms. In addition, a number of teachers were acutely aware of the discrepancy between programs that were established at the state level and the response to them by the local educational administration. A high school social studies teacher stated, for example, that:

> They're almost amusing to look at because you can see administration down at the school level figuring how to get around it, how to pervert the intent of the legislature.(42, M, W, Sr/H, Soc.Stud.)

The lack of coordinated effort increases the amount of change teachers experience with curriculum as well as disbelief that they are implementing a systematic scientific program. Many teachers expressed the feeling that they often barely had time to

assimilate change mandated by one authority before change mandated by another authority took its place. As a senior high school teacher explained:

> Our school system changes so fast. One year we are doing one thing. Then we don't stay in it long enough to see if it's really going to work. They change over to something else. It's just too much changing for one thing. The requirements have changed so many times it's just unreal. I don't even know the requirements myself now because they change so much.(67, F, B, Sr/M, Phys.Ed./Math)

Constant change and the need to adapt to new conditions is by no means the only problem expressed by the teachers interviewed. Instead of usable scientific norms, teachers felt that underdeveloped and unrealistic standards are at the core of legislated learning. A high school teacher observed that the standards are erroneous because a significant part of the problem addressed by the reforms is not necessarily within the schools. As he put it, a:

> ...longer school day is a good idea, but don't increase the time per period, increase the number of subjects taught. The number of requirements for High School graduation is fine, but don't neglect some good electives because of it. A longer day is good again, if you increase the amount of classes. Time is not quality. More homework? I'd be happy if parents would enforce the homework that they get. If the parents would see they are actually studying.(18, M, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.)

The teachers interviewed expressed, in a number of instances, their feeling that their professional competency was being challenged on the basis of poorly developed evaluation tools that did not effectively evaluate their work. A senior high school teacher described her experience with the master teacher exam saying:

> I think that they consider that I'm competent anyway. When the test scores came out, apparently they all say that I've got the highest test scores on that, and I see some people do like this.... although the test was so meaningless that I can't see what difference the score makes.(30, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Affirming this observation, a high school biology teacher wondered about why he needed to be tested in areas that were not particularly pertinent to his teaching area and day-to-day activity in the classroom.

> They're testing teachers, "You have to be competent in your field." I am competent in my field, but the test is going to judge me on my math skills, and perhaps on even specific points in grammar. I don't teach math and grammar, I teach biology. The math I teach in biology that my kids need to know, I'm capable of teaching, but I can't teach calculus. So, don't tell me I'm incompetent, because my English spelling isn't so good. When I see a mistake I correct it, and I use my dictionary, and I try desperately not to misspell, but that doesn't make a biology teacher.(18, M, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.)

In attempting to set up a system of instruction based on the assumption that "scientific" principles of education exist, legislated learning in Florida has produced, in the eyes of teachers, instead of a science which supports effective teaching, a system of checking up that goes far beyond master teacher tests. Another such area of teacher concern was teacher evaluation. An elementary teacher saw the teacher evaluation program (TADS) set up in Dade County in response to state legislation as mandating a scientific model that, to her, is impossible to effectively implement:

> Because no principal has the time to administer that thing the way it is supposed to be done. No principal has the time to do it. In a school with as many classroom teachers as mine has, somewhere between 900 to 1,000 children in that building, can you imagine how many teachers there are? (36,

F, W, Elem/L, Spec.Ed./L.D.)

A junior high school teacher agreed with her when he said:

> ...there are 120 items on this rating scale. I'd like to know how any individual can go into a classroom and observe and rate a teacher on 120 items in a matter of 40 minutes. I think it's impossible. I think you have to guess at some of them.(23, M, W, Jr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

It would be inaccurate to present the voice of teachers as seeing the science underlying legislated learning as totally ineffective. At times teachers found the mandated programs of assistance to them. Ironically, in some instances certain teachers found themselves demanding that a reform be implemented which their building principal was reluctant to implement. A senior high school health teacher explained how:

> Up until this year, the book I was teaching out of, for the health classes, was a 21 year old book. What was very interesting was that I just went ahead and ordered $4000.00 worth of books and my principal got really upset. I had to sit him down and make him understand that we're in violation of state laws. What ended up happening was we were observed by the Southern Association Accreditation this year. I told him, if they walk into my classroom and take a look at the books I'm using and I don't have the books that are state mandated, we're not going to be accredited, that's first. Second, I'm not going to lie.(15, M, W, Sr/L, Gen.Sci.)

This positive effect of the mandating of up-to-date materials through legislated learning does not mitigate against a teacher assessment that the science underlying it is, to a great extent, underdeveloped. The concept of underdeveloped presumes that there is a grain of truth in the position held. The problem is presenting that grain of truth as if it were a fully developed solution to the problem. Other positive aspects of legislated learning were identified by the teachers. As one elementary

teacher commented on the need for valid and useful performance standards and assessments:

> I think overall it is really justified because that way we can really pinpoint, to a certain extent, where the child is, how far he has progressed. We have to have some sort of basis for this.(27, F, W, Elem/M, 2nd)

Despite these positive elements of improved materials, standards and assessments, the assistance that is provided by legislated learning does not portray a coherent approach based on a clearly outlined science of education. Rather, teachers find the implementation of legislated learning as primarily a political process lacking in practical teacher input, constituted by uncoordinated changes, unrealistic standards and, at times, demeaning and inappropriate treatment of competent professionals.

Pliable Students

In relation to the assumption of schooling situations in which "the child is pliable, at least within the range of normal aptitudes and normal expectations," teachers saw legislated learning as dealing with only some students' needs while ignoring others. Thus students are forced beyond their capacity to be pliable.

In the 1984 survey of Dade County Public School teachers on which this report is partly based, teachers overwhelmingly reported that the most important school goals for elementary school students were "the basic tools for acquiring and communicating knowledge--the three R's" and "efficient use of the three R's." for secondary school students the goals were

"efficient use of the three R's" and "a continuing desire for knowledge, the inquiring mind."(Kottkamp, et al., 1986) If the history of American education is a "crusade against ignorance," (Ravitch, 1983. p. xi) then the teachers who supplied the data for this study are in accord with the basic purpose of education.

However, in addition to describing their orientation and goals for schooling, the teachers reported on the satisfaction and rewards they found in teaching. In terms of satisfactions, the overwhelming response was reaching a student or knowing students had learned. In addition, when reporting rewards that were most important to them, Dade County teachers once again focused on reaching students.(Kottkamp, et al., 1986)

In the survey data the teachers demonstrated a concern not only for cognitive achievement, i.e., teaching subject matter, teaching subject matter, but also for a social or affective achievement, i.e., reaching students or helping students develop as individuals. Their attitude that both cognitive and social/ affective achievement are somewhat equal goals for education is not an attitude shared by Florida state legislators. An emphasis almost solely on cognitive achievement is clearly evident from the very beginning of the legislated learning program in Florida. In the Florida Educational Accountability Act of 1976, the legislature outlined the role of students in legislated reform when they promised to:

> Guarantee to each student in the Florida system of public education that the system provides instructional programs with minimum performance standards compatible with the state's plan for education.

Florida's program of legislated learning clearly places performance standards as its major goal. The performance standards outlined in subsequent legislation was predominantly cognitive in orientation. In the legislation, students are not viewed as people to be helped to develop as individuals, but rather as a cohort of persons to be challenged to achieve by reform. This difference, between the legislated reforms and the attitudes which teachers have developed based on experience, is a major source of dissonance.

From their experience, teachers have found the reforms lacking because they underrate the scope of student needs in the learning process. As an elementary school teacher observed:

> I think a lot of administrators forget that we are teaching children. We're not teaching reading or math or social studies. We're teaching children to know these subjects and I think that makes a big difference.(24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary)

In the mind of this teacher, understanding the full needs of students in the process of education and an understanding of the limits of their pliability are essential for reaching even the narrow goals of the legislated reform.

The measurement of only cognitive student achievement through testing and evaluation procedures imposed as part of the legislated learning process clearly influenced the perceptions of the teachers interviewed about the problems of working at a particular grade level or with a particular type of student. This same elementary school teacher, for example, commented:

I don't want third grade because of all the testing nonsense

> that goes on. Also, you're responsible for the prep program and the Chapter One program and now the child abuse and the sexual abuse program. I want to get in and teach kids to read and write and to live with themselves.(24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary)

According to the teachers, too great a concern on the part of the administration for focusing on cognitive achievement assessed through testing and evaluation has led to testing being presented as an end in itself. An elementary school teacher complained:

> ...pressures as far as meeting testing deadlines are to a point where testing seems to be of a level of importance, which I think is necessary. But, it should not be the overall factor for achieving or measuring achievement. There is a lot of pressure for accountability. Make sure you taught these skills rather than make sure the children passed particular skills before moving on to something else. That particular kind of pressure is hard.(27, F, W, Elem/M, 2nd)

This change to a focus solely on cognitive achievement assessed through testing and evaluation is not simply a philosophical difference. Teachers and students are at times disoriented and distracted from the fuller task of teaching and learning of subject matter by these processes. The disorientation, from the larger task, experienced by teachers in meeting the demands of assessment procedures of limited focus can be seen in a high school teacher's reflections on the process of being observed for the master teacher program.

> Some days you get a good response from the whole class. The day I was observed for the Master Teacher Program by the in-school observer, it didn't seem like the class was going very well. I would have rated it a "C." I was a little frustrated. I was trying to show them how to do character descriptions by what the character looks like, what he says, or what other people think. We were creating characters and they were working in small groups. It seemed like there was a lot of playing around going on. I collected their finished product the next day and took it home. I laughed.

> My side was splitting. It was just wonderful. They came out with the most delightful things and they really did understand what was going on. That made me reevaluate some of the bad days.(30, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng)

Even the actual process of evaluation can be a distraction from learning for the students whose teacher is being evaluated. An elementary school special education teacher explained that:

> In an exceptional student education program, you might have a time when you might only have two or three students and somebody comes in and sits down. Those children usually feel very uncomfortable. With most exceptional students, it seems as though, when somebody comes in the students feel they're invading their area.(64, F, W, Elem/H, Spec.Ed./L.D.)

Besides the distractions from the fuller task of teaching and learning caused by the narrowly focused processes mandated by legislated learning, teachers also expressed concern about the interference in student/teacher relations resulting from mandated programs. An elementary school teacher explained how having to deal solely with cognitive requirements imposed on her by legislated learning prevented her from fulfilling the needs of a student.

> Just recently a little girl came up to me whose mother has had a series of lovers. She doesn't have a father that lives at home. She wanted my attention. I knew she deserved it and I had to say, "I'm sorry, Shantara. I can't talk to you now. I have to do charts and then after that I have to work on clusters. After that I have to do the skill pack." I just felt at a loss and it made me very depressed and angry as well.(19, F, W, Elem/H, 3rd)

In addition, the cognitive needs of students were not even being fully met because of the types of performance demands imposed by legislated learning. As one junior high school teacher remarked:

> When we went back to basics a lot of kids improved. But,

> for the brighter kids you don't have to go back to the basics with them. They already have it. They know.(45, M, B, Jr/L, Soc.Stud./Civ./Gov.)

In such a case, brighter students are asked to repeat their performance of already achieved goals to meet the requirements to document student achievement. Not only brighter students are underserved by the cognitive mandates imposed by legislating learning, but teachers also feel that students on the lower end of the academic spectrum are shortchanged. A high school graphic arts teacher explained how:

> I had a youngster that was retarded. We have retarded kids here. The only problem was communication. In the beginning we were real uncomfortable with each other, not because of her, but because I had to explain and I was afraid that it was becoming a problem for her. I don't believe that the child should be in the school. It is overwhelming for them. I believe that we shouldn't mainstream children of this type. We're not doing them a service. If there is one tiny area that a child has a problem with, and they can function in the regular classroom, fine. But a child with Downs Syndrome in the regular high school, I don't believe as a tax-payer that I should be responsible for this child. That may sound awfully hard, but they need to get special help, which we don't have the time to provide.(18, M, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.)

The teachers interviewed indicated that in many instances they develop strategies and coping mechanisms for dealing with the problems imposed on them by the legislated learning process. In employing these mechanisms to assist students learn both cognitively and affectively, they resort to methods as extreme as lying in their written lesson plans, teaching what is not officially recorded as part of their lesson plans and only covering the mandated requirements in a superficial manner while in fact emphasizing a more personally based learning agenda that

they feel is more worthwhile to the students' learning and educational development. An elementary school teacher expressed her strategy for coping when she said:

> I lie in my lesson plans....I do it quite a bit....Sometimes I think I know better what the kids should be doing. I try to do as much of that as I can.(40, F, W, Elem/H, 2nd)

Another elementary school teacher described how:

> In Chapter One we are not allowed to teach Social Studies, Science and Health. We're not even allowed to teach Literature. I teach Reading, Math and Expressive Language. The Expressive Language has to help in the Literature. It's all rolled up into one. We can look in books and we can refer to them. But as far as saying, "I am teaching Health today, or Social Studies or whatever," we can't say that. But, it's in there.(16, F, B, Elem/M, Intermediate)

One high school teacher expressed the relation between the mandates and her own agenda this way:

> You can't even after 30 years--I would never go into a class and just teach off the top of my head. I have to know where I'm going and what I'm doing. But does it have to be spelled out: "The student will be able to:" and "Objective #10," "Objective #11," and "Dade County Objective #6." There are some schools that are doing that. Fortunately, we are not doing that here. We can still spell it out pretty much in our own terms.(25, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Another high school teacher expressed his concern for the particular needs of students when he commented that real learning and performance were:

> Seeing somebody actually being able to accomplish something. Seeing a kid come in who does not even know what a half inch is on a ruler, being able to at the end of the year draw me a complete set of floor plans for a house. Seeing a kid who has never even touched a camera, let alone take pictures, turn around and develop color prints. Things like that. (39, M, W, Sr/L, Industrial Arts)

In remarks such as these, many of the teachers interviewed did not see themselves as deliberately opposing or subverting the

system, rather they viewed themselves as professionals trying to meet the learning agenda of the individual needs of their students. They saw themselves as responsible and accountable for students. Professional responsibility and accountability demanded of them that they respond not to the limited cognitive agenda legislated mandates imposed upon them, but what they felt was a higher responsibility to the full array of learning needs of their students. An elementary school teacher described this responsibility as follows:

> Accountability for what children learn. I think we are very vulnerable to that, and I think we should be. When you hear teachers say that we are not responsible, I think they're wrong. I think we are. If we have children for 7 1/2 hours a day, we are responsible for their learning. But, not every child is going to learn at a very high level.(48, F, H, Elem/M, 6th)

From the interview data, the dual goals of cognitive achievement (conveying subject matter) and social/affective achievement (reaching students or helping them grow in attitudes and motivation) are not simply goals that teachers would like to achieve. For the teachers both of these goals are essential to the responsibility they have assumed in taking on the role of teacher. Thus, the fact that legislated learning has focused on only the goal of cognitive achievement puts teachers in the difficult situation of choosing simply to follow the law or to follow the dictates of their consciences concerning the responsibility that they have as professionals to provide a more holistic education for their students. Such a dilemma is certainly a disincentive to teaching. In addition, it is a lack

of recognition on the part of legislators of the teacher's need for autonomy in exercising their role of dealing with the variability of student abilities and accomplishments in the face of universal performance criteria.(Bidwell, 1965)

Pliable Teachers

In addition to their reactions to the intended limited focus of legislated learning on cognitive achievement, teachers reported their experience of troublesome unintended outcomes which contradicted the stated intentions of the laws enacted. Such outcomes tested the unstated "theory" that "the teacher is pliable and will modify his or her behavior to comply with legislation, court orders, regulations, or scientific knowledge about education." The primary unintended outcome of legislated learning, experienced by teachers, was the feeling that they would never be recognized as fully mature and functional professionals. Although the state legislature enacted a program intended to reward master teachers with merit pay, the teachers often found the experience of pursuing recognition through examinations and observations to be degrading. In fact, they characterized the experience as one of being treated like a beginning teacher. This unintended outcome pits hopes for recognition as a "master" teacher against the reality of being treated like a "neophyte" teacher. Such a reality asks the teacher to put compliance with legislated learning above their concern for personal and professional respect.

As part of the master teacher program, a subject area test

was created to ensure that teachers could deliver the subject matter prescribed for student performance. However, the results of the test did not always correlate with ratings of observed performance. This gave teachers contradictory assessments of their performance and the quality of their preparedness and performance. As one junior high school teacher explained,

> We were observed and when the observations [for merit pay] went in I got all kinds of bonus points and everything. The principal said that I had the top rating of any teacher in the school. When it came out, the lowest teacher in our school, the one they want--that they are writing prescriptions on--got 25 points higher than I did.(01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.)

This experience was confirmed by a high school teacher who reported the reaction of her school to the master teacher test as follows:

> The scores came through the building. So we were opening them all at the same time and I saw a teacher just demoralized. I could just see it crushed her because her whole life is teaching and she's an excellent teacher.(30, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

The design of the test was not the only problem teachers found with this approach to validating their ability to teach subject matter. Not every subject area had an appropriate test available for teachers to take. In some cases, other problems interfered with teachers being able to take the test on only one specific date. As the same teacher reported:

> The debate teachers were not allowed to take the [Master Teacher] test, because the statewide debate championship was that weekend.... They were told to see how well the classroom program comes out and then, if the ranking were high enough, they'll take the test. They were also told that they may have the option of being rated just on the classroom performance, disregarding the test. That's absurd if the rest of us have to take the test.(30, F, W, Sr/H,

Lang.Arts/Eng.)

The teachers' reaction to the master teacher test reflected their feeling that the process treated them like beginning teachers. Testing for entrance into the profession of teaching was seen by many of the teachers in a positive light. Ongoing testing was seen as disregarding the fact that the teachers had accumulated professional experience and status. An elementary school teacher phrased it this way:

> I think they're getting the idea of accountability in academics, which is great. But, it's got to start at the beginning. By the beginning, I'm talking about teacher education classes. I think certification for teachers anywhere needs to start with testing, not waiting until somebody's teaching.(24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary)

The problem of career teachers being treated as neophytes also appeared in accounts given by experienced teachers who came from other parts of the country and had come to work in Dade County. Teachers in this situation had to take the certification exam normally given to beginning teachers. Many saw this as an affront to their professionalism. One junior high school teacher explained:

> I was insulted when I had to take the teacher's test in Florida. I had taught already five years in California, I come from a state that requires five years for credentials. I was insulted that they made me take the test, not because they made me take the test but because the test was so demeaning.(21, F, H, Jr/M, 6th)

Although it was a prime example, the master teacher program was not the only example of legislated learning that made experienced teachers feel like they were being treated as though they were beginning teachers. The general movement towards

accountability through legislated learning was characterized in the following way by a veteran high school teacher:

> All this stress on accountability in the classroom ends up burdening conscientious teachers. I don't think it bothers those that need to be shaped up.(30, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/ Eng.)

Beyond the master teacher program, the burden of compliance and the stress on their pliability most often identified by teachers was the paperwork that is connected to teaching.(Cohn, et al., 1987) A classic form of teacher paperwork is the lesson plan. Given increased regulation under legislated learning, teachers felt stronger local school pressure on even this traditional paperwork. Veteran teachers felt that there has to be a time in a teaching career when such paperwork is no longer necessary. As one high school teacher with fifteen years experience explained:

> I spend two hours a week on lesson plans, because they have to be written precisely. I can understand it for a new teacher. When I was new I had to do them. But at this point I shouldn't have to.(18, M, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.)

Experienced successful teachers complained that the burden of paperwork for accountability gets in the way of successful teaching. According to a high school chemistry teacher:

> Well, some people need to be pressured, other people don't. Again it depends upon the individual. I personally would rather spend my time getting the material across to the students than have to sit at the desk filling out forms.(47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.)

In addition, experienced teachers complained that compliance with many accountability plans focusing on school-wide improvement (Provenzo, et al., 1987) in reality placed the additional burden of carrying poor teachers. In such programs a teacher is

considered successful only if the school he or she works in is rated as successful. One high school teacher observed:

> A teacher who may be weak, or the word that's used at school is leech. It's like their sucking up your information, your creativity. Your work and teaching is a profession where the kids do that all day. You have to have a lot of patience because it is a giving profession. There doesn't seem to be that much left over for the other teachers. Most teachers, especially at my school, resent that.(35, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

In some particular schools because of local implementation of legislated learning, teachers felt that they were demeaned as professionals by procedures such as having their work "checked on" and being forced to teach according to "a recipe." as this same teacher said:

> During the year we were asked to take ten folders for a sample to see if we were following the Writing Enhancement Act. We pulled ten folders from students' work. Then we were supposed to log them and their assignments and everything to see if we were complying with the law, which we were. When we got the folders back there were notes to the teachers, not about the students' work, but about why didn't we grade this way or wouldn't it be nice if you used stamps or something on students' work. Just little stuff so that it seemed we were being graded.((35, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

An elementary school teacher reported on her experience of teaching in a Chapter One program:

> It's more than a guideline. It's almost like this is what you are to do. Here's the book. It's your Bible and this is what you are to use. This is what you are to do. I think that if they're going to give teachers recipes, then they really don't need teachers. They can use a master teacher with an aide and get the same thing accomplished.(24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary)

In reflecting on the difference between the neophyte and master teacher, the teachers interviewed were virtually unanimous in their belief that one of the rewards for experienced and

successful teaching should be greater freedom and autonomy in the classroom. However, many veteran teachers felt that instead of gaining freedom during the development of their career, they had in fact lost freedom, primarily as a result of legislated learning programs. As one high school teacher explained:

> I feel much less freedom in the classroom than we had when I first started teaching. I really don't like the fact that most teachers have to do the same thing just about everyday. We have a yearly calendar and within that framework we have to do planning on the same grade level for all the teachers. To me that stunts my creativity.(35, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/ Eng.)

This loss of freedom even affected student performance according to an elementary school teacher:

> I was much freer to teach sixteen years ago than I am now. With this requirement and that requirement and the other requirement. Take this test and do this thing. They take away 30% of my teaching. The kids go to gifted. They're smart supposedly. They're getting terrible grades, but they miss one day a week for gifted. Instead of teaching the subject matter in five days, they're going to teach it in four. That might be one of the problems.(01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.)

At a time when the teaching profession in Dade County is populated with a significantly more experienced and formally educated group of individuals than has been the case in the past (Kottkamp, et al., 1986), legislated learning ironically, in demanding increased compliance and putting stress on teacher pliability, is granting less recognition to the wealth of experience the present teaching population has. Legislated learning has upset the "balance" (Lortie, 1969) between control and autonomy in teaching. The increase of government control has lessened the autonomy implicitly extended to teachers previously.

Lortie (1986) also observes that this phenomenon of "a system that continues to work in ways that mature, experienced and highly prepared teachers do not consider appropriate to their qualifications and their current realities,"(p. 571) may be creating a status related structural rather than personal strain. One can logically ask how veteran teachers can be expected to remain in the profession, if they are treated like neophytes, who push papers and are constantly being graded, instead of seasoned professionals? From the teacher interviews, it seems that methods appropriate to recruitment and selection of new teachers are inappropriately being used to evaluate experienced teachers.

Cost-Effectiveness

As the fourth of the rationalistic assumptions underlying legislated learning, Wise posited, "If shown the way, people prefer cost-effective behavior over behavior which is not cost effective." Although the legislated learning program was intended to be cost effective, teachers find that these programs bring increased burdens which limit their effectiveness in teaching and thus increase the "cost" to get the job done. In addition, these programs threaten strides toward equity made in the schools and thus threaten increased costs to regain lost ground in the equity battle.

Increased Burden

If there is a single way to describe their overall reaction, the teachers in the interviews primarily view legislated learning

as a burden. As anyone might, some teachers seek to avoid the burden. A junior high school teacher expressed her response this way:

> You can't get things done if you follow all the rules. I don't break rules that are detrimental to anybody's health or welfare. But, I'm not one for following the rules.(01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.)

Very few of the teachers expressed a desire for open defiance of the system, but many talked frequently about subtly subverting it. A junior high teacher expressed his approach this way:

> Subject matter-wise, the majority of it is determined downtown by somebody I've never met. They say you can talk about this, but you can't talk about that [Life Management Skills]. As far as the classroom, with that type of thing, I've got all the power. I can deal with it in any manner, within reason, that I so desire.(73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./ Health)

Another junior high school teacher reiterated the degree to which teachers have the power, ultimately, to control what does or does not go on in their classrooms:

> [In this school] You know once you close that door, you teach what you want to teach.(65, M, W, Jr/H, Sci.Bio.)

Yet no matter how much teachers try to avoid the imposition of legislated mandates upon them, they can never completely shut out their impact. Nowhere is this more evident than in the case of paperwork. As stated above, the paperwork resulting from these mandates is the greatest of teacher burdens. Yet, paperwork is nothing new for teachers. A veteran senior high school teacher recalled, for example, how it was in the mid-1950s when he first began teaching:

> At the beginning of school we used to have five work days before starting, most of that time was spent filling out

> forms, attendance cards, all kinds of health reports and lockers, and combinations, just paperwork. The old register, was a monthly report that had to go in on attendance that involved extremely long, complicated multiplication problem at the end. This was long before calculators, it had to be done on paper, and mine never came out right. There was a ton of paperwork, then it got lighter and lighter and lighter. It seemed to be going elsewhere, and now it is back.(51, M, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/ Eng.)

What is new compared to the 1950s is the type of paperwork and the restrictions that are placed on teachers in completing that paperwork. Although at times not a part of legislated learning, this increased work is viewed by teachers as a result of the move to increased regulation. This same teacher goes on to say:

> It's the grade book for one thing. It's not just grades and attendance anymore. We have to indicate whether the assignment was done inside of class or outside of class. When there is a tardy to class we have to note in a separate part of the grade book that we have talked to the student about it, on the second we have to make a phone call to the parent and so note it, on the third we have to write a referral. Now the referrals are going onto computer forms, which I have no argument with, I work with computers too. It is so complicated, the time has to be military type. Just complicated: Parent Contacted-Yes/No, For this offense-Yes/No, Other Offense-Yes/No, Written Contact-Yes/No. It is just a referral. In this grade book you have to have the dates of the parent contact, the result of the contact, then you have to transfer it to another card. I don't know if that's just our school or not. There are room inventory reports that you never had to do before which involve a lot. (51, M, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

A particular area affecting paperwork is the requirement, in particular schools, of specific forms for lesson plans. One elementary teacher felt this requirement was nothing more than a recipe when she said:

> We have like a Gestapo for that. We do a lot of lesson plans. It's almost like a recipe you find on the back of a Campbell's soup can: the objective, the activity and the assessment. God forbid we don't have all three of them.(19,

F, W, Elem/H, 3rd)

For another teacher this singular approach to lesson planning was ineffective because it did not fit her work as a special educator.

> Your lesson plans are different too. In a regular classroom your lesson plans are totally different. Last year I had fifteen students, which really isn't that many, but I had nine different reading groups. You're writing what you're doing everyday for nine different reading books, and that's just reading. It was busy work. Writing, "this is introduction to vocabulary, oral reading, skill pages, and it's doing decoding, working on plurals," and that's for nine different reading groups. You're filling in these spaces for Monday through Friday.(64, F, W, Elem/H, Spec.Ed./L.D.)

Completing these forms can be frustrating, especially if they are not recognized or evaluated. As one senior high school teacher related:

> I did probably half a year's worth of lesson plans and then I just stopped doing them because you don't get any feedback, you don't get any comments. I sat down for six months and wrote beautiful behavioral objectives and all the materials that I used in my plans and I never got a comment. So I said the heck with it because I would rather spend those two hours preparing a lesson or correcting papers or doing something else.(68, F, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Lesson planning is not the only area of burdensome paperwork for teachers. Lesson Plan books, as small as they are to begin with, are expected, in some schools, to accommodate additional types of regulated information. As an elementary special education teacher noted:

> I don't know. It's strange. They send a lot of memos, little notes down from downtown. They want us to do things. In the plan books this year they wanted us to jot down the conferences we have with the parents. This had to be in the plan book. I don't know if you have ever looked at a plan book and seen how small it is. I mean, they wanted this in the plan book. I couldn't believe it.(43, F, B, Elem/M,

4th)

Not only plans and plan books have been affected, even judgments on grading are in some cases influenced by the imposition of legislated mandates. It was the experience of one junior high teacher that:

> It was the rule then....If I had one good grade per week, one good test per week would do it. You don't have to have four grades. So therefore, it took away from the real teaching, because you know the principal's going to come in. He's going to open your roll book. If I don't have four grades or three grades, I'm in real trouble.(45, M, B, Jr/L, Soc.Stud./Civ./Gov.)

The demand that teachers systematize their work, a fact physically manifested in the growth of paperwork, is seen consistently by the teachers interviewed as distracting them from what they believe to be the primary tasks of teaching. This distraction is described by an elementary school teacher in the following words:

> All the systematizing of objectives to a certain degree puts a lot of pressure on the teacher and takes away some of the creativity and fun of teaching.... Being mandated by the state and the county to teach in a certain way is certainly not creative. It is having to do a tremendous amount of charting and paperwork which are just for audits, that have nothing to do with the real performance of children or teachers. The paperwork is overwhelming.(20, F, W, Elem/H, 2nd)

Creativity is not the only element lost. Another elementary school teacher felt that the mandates of legislated learning actually decreased the time that was spent on teaching. As she expressed it:

> I actually clocked my teaching time for three days and the most I taught on one of those days was 54 minutes....I was filling out prep forms that were due by a particular date. I was preparing materials for children for remediation from

> a third grade assessment test. I was trying to collate materials the children could use and making up stuff for the other kids. I consider that paperwork. Then, we were involved in the QUIIP program and I was trying to get stuff together in reading that children could take home for the whole third grade. What else was involved? Something for Chapter One also had to be written or looked up. This is taking time away from kids.(24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary)

From the perspective of many teachers, legislated learning has placed an undue burden upon them. This burden results from the legislature relying on techniques that do not reflect the reality that teachers face in the classroom. Many teachers are extremely concerned that the increased reliance on legislated learning and the controls implied by its use are redefining the traditional definitions of teaching. One teacher expressed this fear quite articulately:

> As far as I'm concerned what they're trying to guarantee is that you're doing things that you should have been doing anyway (lesson plans, keeping files on students). I think a lot of what they present to the public is the great word accountability. The public perceives something as not happening in the school system, so they develop this program to show the public that it is happening, when in fact it is not anything different from what we had before.(15, M, W, Sr/L, Gen.Sci.)

This emphasis on outward appearances changes the role of the teacher from being a creative and dynamic purveyor of information and ideas to an uncreative evidence gatherer and bookkeeper. Typically, one senior high school teacher expressed her dissatisfaction with such a change when she explained that:

> I don't like filing all the admits, filing all of this, keeping all the evidence, the paperwork, documentation.(30, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

In short, teachers see all the time spent on increased paperwork as decreasing the time spent on teaching and thus

implicitly increasing the cost to get the same job done. Also the burdens imposed by legislated learning are leading teachers to spend additional time and exhaust their creativity in trying to find ways around the law to get the work done. All this means that teachers are now spending valuable time and creativity distracted from teaching.

Threats to Equity

When the Florida state legislature began its program of legislated learning, the legislature expressed concern for the individual student. That concern is clearly reflected in the Educational Accountability Act of 1976, when the legislature promised to:

> Provide a system of accountability for education in Florida which guarantees that each student is afforded similar opportunities for educational advancement without regard to geographic differences and varying local economic factors.

Their concern was in terms of providing equity in educational opportunities for all students. However, the experience of teachers included in these interviews demonstrates that "legislated learning" often brought with it the unintended outcome of diminishing equity for students rather than increasing it and as a result possibly increasing the need for more spending to restore lost equity.

Many teachers described their concern that a single set of performance standards will increase the dropout rate in schools. For one high school teacher it is a simple reality.

> Well anyone would see that if you raise the requirements you're going to have an increase in dropouts. This idea that you're going to be able to wave some kind of a magic wand and suddenly students who couldn't pass one year of science are going to be able to pass two.(42, M, W, Sr/H, Soc.Stud.)

Another high school teacher emphasized the problem's source as being state mandated unitary standards. According to her:

> In Miami here they're complaining about the large dropout rate and so on and so forth. I think that the state is fostering a great deal of that dropout rate. We have kids who do not belong. They're trying to put all kids into one bundle. They don't belong in one bundle.... We're wasting young lives by forcing everybody into this one mold.(55, F, W, Sr/L, Spec.Ed./V.E.)

According to the teachers interviewed, one group of students particularly affected by the performance standards mandated by legislated learning are students in Special Education. The mainstreaming of Special Education students, while intended as a means of creating a more equitable environment for students, when combined together with mandatory performance standards, has the effect of creating a situation in which students with limitations have almost no chance to succeed. As a senior high school teacher explained:

> This is going to sound like probably the most terrible thing I ever could possibly say, but I taught special ed. last summer and I think the only kids that can be mainstreamed are the ones that have any potential for really meeting the level of the class. I don't think you should put kids in who can't meet the level of the class and will require special help, also it detracts from the other kids.(37, M, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts)

Under legislated learning there is a tendency towards standardizing not only curriculum but methods of evaluation for both students and teachers. However, the reality of the classroom is that such uniform methods, and in turn standards, cannot fit

with the heterogeneity found in most classrooms. This is particularly true when exceptional students are mainstreamed. A senior high school special education teacher outlined this problem in the following way:

> They tell us that all of the students, special education students included, should receive a diploma, a standard diploma. They must learn all the standard material that any other child is learning here. We have got to teach a basic regular course for next year. (71, F, B, Sr/M, Spec.Ed./ L.D.)

Proponents of legislated learning could look at these comments and question teachers' desire to challenge students to cognitive achievement. What has been said about the multiple concerns of teachers regarding achievement testifies in favor of teacher desire for student achievement and performance. For the teachers, the problem is not performance standards or no performance standards, but instead teachers see the need for multiple sets of performance standards. Each set should be appropriate to the needs and potentials of the student. As a junior high school teacher asked:

> Wouldn't it be better to put kids like this [exceptional education students] in a vocational track to train them for some future work, rather than bombarding them with all these academics that they can't master in the first place? But Dade County and the State of Florida say that all eighth graders have to have social studies or all ninth graders have to have world history. Whether you can read or not, you have to have it. Is that realistic?(08, F, B, Jr/H, Spec.Ed./V.E.)

In some cases, special education students are not the only pupils needing a different set of performance standards. As one high school teacher observed:

> I think the test scores are valid. I think that we're doing

> a big injustice to our students by not meeting their needs. I like the RAISE Bill because it is bringing up the standards. But, on the other hand, there are a lot of kids who are really not interested in academic areas. We should be branching out and creating more vocational schools or meeting the needs of those students who are not academically oriented. The biggest problem that I see in my classes is apathy from kids who are not interested in pursuing a college education or even any kind of learning that deals with books. I feel that they're bringing down the rest of the class. If they could make provisions for those students, then the kids who are really there to learn from books can get on with what we have to do. Then the other kids also benefit society because they're being trained and they're not creating more of a problem with the dropout rate and welfare and all that stuff.(35, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Inequitably, this defines achievement in unitary terms in opposition to legislated concerns for equal opportunity. In addition to limiting performance standards to one type, legislated learning is limiting the curriculum to dealing with those standards alone. One elementary school teacher saw her job as limited to standards and testing when she said:

> Third and fifth grade teachers at the elementary school, at the beginning of school do nothing but get children ready for the minimum assessment. Once minimum assessment is over they start getting them ready for the Stanford Achievement Test. Once the SAT test is in, the results have come back from the minimum assessment and they are busy remediating all the children in all the areas they missed on state assessment. They never really get a chance to just relax and teach. They are always getting ready for a test.(36, F, W, Elem/L. Spec.Ed./L.D.)

According to a graphics teacher, this impact is also felt on the high school level:

> As a person teaching a graphics class I should not be accountable, yet I am, and I have to take time out of my class to teach English when it should be taught in English, and I have to teach a kid math when it should be taught in math because they are making us do that this year. I have got to spend time out of my class.(39, M, W, Sr/L, Industrial Arts)

For the teachers in the interviews, performance standards and testing, as narrowly defined by legislated learning in Florida, clearly discriminate among students. At times this is good because it informs the teacher about the various ways students are progressing. At other times, it works against the needs of particular students. The need to struggle with that difference was expressed by one high school social studies teacher when he said:

> I try to say there's nothing wrong with the word discrimination, nothing wrong with the fact that tests discriminate. That's what they're for. Pick the difference between the ones that know the answers and the ones that don't know the answers. But in our society that's rather taboo nowadays and I think unfortunately that's what will happen with this accountability.(42, M, W, Sr/H, Soc.Stud.)

The move to increased accountability through legislated learning and performance standards and testing that the legislation mandated, includes elements which tend to increase discrimination and constructs a system whose only response to regain equity is multiple types of schools rather than encouraging schools with multiple programs. The expectation that teachers should enforce this discrimination is clearly a disincentive to professionals who view affective achievement through meeting the particular social and interpersonal needs of and reaching students as essential to their work.

Conclusions

As presented in the beginning of this study, Arthur Wise analyzed the activities of educational policymakers as follows:

> Educational policymakers behave as though they believe that schools operate according to the rationalistic model. That model postulates that schools operate by setting goals, implementing programs to achieve these goals, and evaluating the extent to which the goals are attained. The goal-oriented process is assumed to be effectuated through a bureaucratic distribution of formal authority and work responsibility. It is further assumed that the attainment of goals provides sufficient incentives to drive the system. Policies emanating from a belief in this model are designed to improve the operation of the goal-oriented process. Policies which promise to increase productivity and equity are imposed on the existing structure of the school in the anticipation that they will improve education. (p. 78)

Although this description was written for the general phenomenon of legislated learning, it provides a most accurate definition of the assumptions underlying the state educational legislation passed in Florida since 1976. Fundamental to the actions of the legislature is the assumption that "the attainment of goals provides sufficient incentives to drive the system." The 1984 survey data cited above shows that teachers agree with the legislators on most of the goals of legislated learning. But, as this study also shows, when one listens to teachers talk about the impact of legislated learning on their work, one hears them describe the disincentives that legislated learning creates for teachers.

The failure of teachers to accept readily models of legislated learning imposed on them is not simply a disagreement over individual programs, but represents instead a fundamental rejection on the part of teachers of the rationalistic model of teaching, as defined by Wise. Evidence from the teacher interviews clearly demonstrate Wise's suggestion that:

Teachers, of course, do not, for various reasons, readily

> accept a rationalistic characterization of their roles.... Substantial evidence suggests that the primary reason is that the rationalistic conception of teaching is perceived by teachers as not salient, useful or relevant to the demands of their work. (p. 96)

Wise goes on to further argue that: "Teachers are rational, but not in the ways implied by bureaucratic rationalization." (p. 97)

The evidence from the interviews with teachers indicates that they have consistently developed a highly rational approach to the reality that they confront in their work. Their responses to the problems they face indicate much reflection, as well as a sense of practicality. Yet the evidence of the interviews indicates that little attention is paid to the reality that teachers confront in their work. Instead of a model that relates to the rational understanding teachers have of their work, they find imposed on them what Wise refers to as the "hyperrationalization of the schools," (p. 48) and Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) call a "sense of scientism,", i.e, technology "associated with ideologies and the language and values of science...often not even found in the legitimate sciences." (p.296)

This process of hyperrationalization creates according to Wise: "...more bureaucratic overlay without attaining the intended policy." (p. 47) What is evident for the teachers interviewed is that they perceive enormous contradictions between the demands imposed on them by the mandates of legislated learning (hyperrationalization) and the demands they must fulfill as professionals meeting the needs of their students on a day-to-

day basis. In point of fact, the hyperrationalization of the schools is irrational, and the voice of the teachers is a voice of rationality.

The teacher interviews clearly suggest that teachers have, as a group, a rational understanding of schooling. Based on that understanding teachers find certain actual dimensions of schools unaddressed by legislated learning. Among the basic assumptions that the teachers interviewed hold, not addressed by legislated learning, are:

1. Schools are complex organizations which can only be fully understood by experiencing them.

2. For any change in schools to be effective, it must involve a process of ordered change, which takes into account the previous reality of the schools.

3. The present teaching force are by and large competent professionals.

4. By its nature, teaching is a difficult and demanding profession.

5. As professionals, teachers need to be able to be creative and make their own judgments about how to conduct their work.

6. Affective achievement ("reaching" students) is as important a goal for teaching as is cognitive achievement (the delivery of subject matter).

7. As professionals, teachers improve and mature through the practice of teaching.

8. In order to treat students equitably, schools must take into account real differences among students.

As a result of the fact that the hyperrationalization of the schools through legislated learning does not take the above assumptions of teachers into account, the teachers experience

identifiable circumstances in teaching which act as disincentives to their remaining in the profession. These include:

1. The lack of recognition of their understanding of schools and the educational process in the development of educational reform.

2. Constant and inconsistent changes in the teaching program.

3. Evaluation and incentive programs whose techniques imply a questioning of teachers' professional competence.

4. Added burdens in an already difficult work situation.

5. Formulas and models which needlessly regulate and control rather than enhance teaching.

6. A system which rejects people in favor of products.

7. A system which refuses to recognize the experience teachers have accumulated from their work in the field and which insists on always treating them as beginning teachers.

8. A system which unfairly treats students who are truly different as if they were the same.

Policy Recommendations

Based on the research reported in this study, the following policy recommendations are proposed:

1. That the developers of legislated educational reform concretely involve classroom teachers in the development of reforms. This involvement should not be limited to testimony on pending bills, but should include input from teachers to legislative staff on bills before they are introduced into the legislature.

2. That any legislated reform recognize teaching as a profession constituted of competent and mature professionals through evaluation and certification programs parallel to those of other professions. Such evaluation should include provision for differences of experience, freedom and autonomy for teachers to make professional judgments, and length of service in the profession.

3. That the impact of legislated educational reform on equity be annually reviewed. Such a review should focus on

> the impact of the implementation of such reforms on students because these reforms may so seriously affect different groups of students in highly different ways, that the opportunities for some students to receive equitable treatment in schools can be significantly diminished.

The implementation of these recommendations will not add an undue burden to those seeking to reform education through the legislative process. The first recommendation can easily be implemented since legislatures function primarily through committee work with the aid of unelected staff. The input of teachers in the development of educational bills to be introduced would increase the possibility of effective legislation, and possibly lessen the amount of time needed for testimony in committee hearings after a bill is introduced. In addition, teacher lobbying organizations should form alliances with other power groups in the legislative process so as to impact more directly the forces which influence the development and enactment of educational legislation.

The second recommendation does nothing more than extend to teachers the model of professional recognition that legislatures have already mandated for professional groups such as physicians and lawyers. Just as they are regularly recertified without having to take their medical boards or bar exams over and over again, so too should experienced teachers not have to redemonstrate initial competence for recertification. The task of developing such legislation should be relatively simple, since the basic work has already been done in the development of the regulation legislation for the other professions. Linda Darling-

Hammond (1986), in presenting a model of evaluation for teachers comparable to evaluation in other professions, states:

> In the long run, efforts to enhance professional accountability, if they involve teachers as full partners, can bolster the authority and control of teachers over the substance and conduct of their profession. On the other hand, failure to deal with the problems of teacher supervision will lead only to increased bureaucratic controls over education and further deprofessionalization of teaching. (p.550)

The third recommendation is necessary because legislative reform in education on the state and local level may be having an unintended impact on federal programs intended to protect the rights of students to an equal education. This can be done by the requirement for state legislatures to report annually on the anticipated impact of educational legislation, enacted during the previous year, on the legal rights of students to receive an equal education. Such reports would be similar to environmental impact studies. Although this creates an additional reporting mechanism, forethought concerning the impact of legislation on equity should decrease the need for federal intervention to rectify inequities resulting from the implementation of legislated learning at the state and local level.

REFERENCES

Bidwell, C.E. (1965). The school as formal organization. In Mench, J.G. (ed.). Handbook of organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Boleman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1985). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cohn, M.M., McCloskey, G.N., Kottkamp, R.B. & Provenzo, E.F., Jr. (1987). Teachers' perspectives on the problems of their profession: Implications for policy makers and practitioners. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Contract # ERI-P-86-3090.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1986). A proposal for evaluation in the teaching profession. The Elementary School Journal, 86, 531-551.

Kottkamp, R. B., Provenzo, E. F., Jr. & Cohn, M. M. (1986). Stability and change in a profession: Two decades of teacher attitudes, 1964-1984. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 559-567.

Laws of Florida. 1976-1984.

Lortie, D.C. (1986). Teacher status in Dade County: A case of structural strain? Phi Delta Kappan, 67 (8), 568-575.

_____ (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____ (1969). The balance of control and autonomy in elementary school teaching. In Etzioni, A. (ed.) The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers. New York: Free Press, 1-53.

Lehne, R. (1983). Research perspectives on state legislatures and educational policy. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 5, 43-54.

The nation responds: Recent efforts to improve education. (1984). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Provenzo, E.F., Jr., McCloskey, G.N., Cohn, M.M., Kottkamp, R.B. & Proller, N. (1987). A comparison of individual and school-level approaches to merit pay: A case study of the Dade

County Public Schools. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Contract # ERI-P-86-3089.

Ravitch, D. (1983). The troubled crusade: American education 1945-1980. New York: Basic Books.

Sergiovanni, T.J. & Starratt, T.J. (1983). Supervision: Human perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Teacher Work, Incentives and Rewards: A Twenty Year Perspective (A National Institute of Education Project). Contract # NIE-G83-0067, 1983-1985.

Wise, A. (1979). Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.